# DESCRIPTION OF A NEW LANTERN FISH. 

BY HENRY W. FOWLER.

## MYCTOPHID $\notin$.

 CENTROBRANCHUS gen. nov.Type Centrobranchus charocephatus sp. nov:
Close to Rhinoscopclus Lïtken, but differing in the gill-rakers, which are short sparse clusters of asperities on the first arch.

Centrobranchus chœrocephalus sp. nov.
Rhinoscopelus coruscans Fowler, Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Phila., 1900. p. 498. Near the Sandwich Islands. (Dr. William H. Jones.) (Jot of Richardson.)
Rhinoscopelus oceanicus Jordan and Evermann, Bull. U. s. Fish Comm., 1902 (1903), p. 168 . (Not description. Part.)
Head $3 \frac{7}{5}$; depth 5 ; D. 10 ; A. 18; scales 3.5 in a lateral series to base of caudal; about 6 seales in a transverse series at origin of rayed dorsal ; depth of head $1 \frac{1}{2}$ in its length; width of head $2 \frac{1}{3}$ : snout $4 \frac{1}{2}$; cye $3 \frac{2}{3}$; interorbital space $3 \frac{1}{2}$; maxillary $1 \frac{3}{4}$; least depth of caudal peduncle 5 .

Body clongate, well compressed, slender and tapering posteriorly, upper profile a little more convex anteriorly, and greatest depth about origin of ventral. Caudal peduncle long, slender, and its more or less even depth about $3 \frac{1}{2}$ in length from adipose fin.

Head shaped somewhat like that of an Anchory, upper profile a little more convex especially at occiput, and well compressed. Snout protruding beyond mouth, conic, and a little shorter than orbit. Eye small, circular, about midway in depth and near first third of head. Mouth large, inferior, maxillary narrow or slender, of even width, and extending posteriorly well beyond orbit. Mandibular rami formed of rather broad bones and extending far back like maxillary. Teeth in jaws and on palatines minute, and in narrow bands. Vomer with similar teeth, though a little more conspicuous. Tongue a short conic protuberance in front of mouth. Interorbital space convex. A slight mesial clevation in the internasal depression.

Gill-opening extending forward opposite middle of orbit. Rakers about $3+5$ clusters or groups of small inconspicuous prickles on first arch. Filaments small. Pseudobranchiæ present. Isthmus narrow and trenchant.

Scales large, edges mostly entire, cycloid, stiff, and rather narrowly imbricated along middle of side. A few small scales on base of caudal, fins otherwise naked. Lateral line not evident.

Three mandibular photophores. One on lower auterior portion of opercle. An interorbital photophore. One at lower base of pectoral, and another just below along edge of gill-opening. Five thoracie. One anterolateral, above base of ventral. One mediolateral low, and just a little behind and above tip of ventral. Another apparently mediolateral, two scales behind and a little higher. Posterolateral inconspicuous, median in depth, and also about midway between dorsals over breach in anals. Ventrals four. Five anals, then a breach and finally four more. Six more continued along lower side of caudal peduncle without a breach, then two more. Two caudals below. One caudal above. Six large supercaudals, beginning just behind adipose fin.

Dorsal rather small, inserted nearer tip of snout than base of caudal, and posterior base opposite front of anal. Anal long, inserted nearly midway between posterior margin of pupil and base of caudal, anterior rays highest. Adipose dorsal small, a little before end of base of anal. Caudal small. Pectoral small, inserted a little below middle of depth of body. Ventral small, inserted near last third in space between origin of pectoral and that of dorsal.

Color in alcohol deep dusky with iridescent bluish, purplish and silvery reflections. Fins plain pale brownish. Photophores black, with bright silvery centers. Supercaudals with dull yellowish. Iris dull dark yellowish.

Length $1 \frac{5}{16}$ inches.
Type No. 7,972 , A. N. S. P. Near the Sandwich Islands. Dr. William H. Jones. Also three co-types with same data, and the smallest of these, together with the type, may probably be males as they are a little more attenuate than the others.

Originally I wrongly identified these examples with Myctophum coruscans Richardson. Drs. Jordan and Evermann consider them identical with their Rhinoscopclus occanicus. If occanicus is correct generically it is certainly distinet from the examples before me of cherocephalus. Examination of $R$. coccoi, typical of that genus, show that it has long, slender and numerous gill-rakers on the first arch. $R$. oceanicus would further differ in the large eye ( $2 \frac{1}{2}$ in head) and deeper body ( $4 \frac{1}{10}$ in length).
(Xoîpos, pig; kepaìi, head.)

